



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

maxim of self-love. It may very well be our duty to make a real sacrifice of our own good for the sake of goodness in general; and there is no psychological impossibility in doing so.

I have noticed two misprints. On page 229 'Rationalists' is printed when 'Naturalists' is meant. And on page 262 'the *un*-conscious subject' should surely be 'the conscious subject.'

C. D. BROAD.

University of St. Andrews.

MODERN PROBLEMS. By Sir Oliver Lodge, F. R. S., Principal of the University of Birmingham. London: Methuen & Co., 1912. Pp. 320.

These "essays on debatable subjects," as the author calls them, deal largely with social questions. With his practical views I find myself in all but complete agreement, both as regards spirit and details. Put in my own words, his position is that the freer and fuller life of the individual is the end of social life, and that this is to be attained not by restricting, but by developing State-action all along the line. This I also am content to accept as a working faith. What seems to me lacking is some theoretical doctrine that would raise it above empiricism. As illustrations of such a body of doctrine we may take, for example, Philosophical Liberalism, Positivism, or Socialism. Each of these, for those who can adopt it as a creed, furnishes some generalized basis of action. Instead, Sir Oliver Lodge has only the appeal to 'Christianity' in the sense of the ethical ideal implied in certain selected precepts of the New Testament not at all peculiar to Christianity, but common to pagan and Christian moralists in the second century of the Roman Empire. So in politics when he means the ideal State, he speaks of "the ideal Christian State." But in reality this, if we go to documentary authority, is not at all a combination of the best features of modern Liberalism and Socialism, as many imagine: it is the theocratic 'City of God,' where "every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people" (Acts, iii, 23). Its maxim is not modern toleration, but exclusion from civic intercourse for those that will not "hear the Church." And the Church is a corporate body having power to declare doctrine: "no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation" (2 Peter, 1, 20). In such a city, Sir

Oliver Lodge would have found that the exercise of what Matthew Arnold called "the imaginative reason" in a direction seeming to theological censors to smack of "paganism and polytheism" brought with it more disagreeable social consequences than any that are now possible for the most outspoken heretic.

Of course I do not suppose that modern educated Christians, even when they are Roman theologians, draw the logical deduction from such passages except "as a speculative opinion" not intended for use. (I remember that in a case in the law courts one of them put it in this way.) But, to leave aside claims no longer seriously taken by the world, and simply looking at the Christian documents as a whole from the side of politics, I think the conservative can make out a better case than the reformer. Lord Hugh Cecil, in his interesting primer of Conservatism, shows himself not only sincere but a good tactician (at least intellectually) in his appeal to the New Testament on behalf of his political creed. Liberal publicists describe him as 'mediæval'; and in his view of the State he is in fact more mediæval than Dante; but this is because he has gone back from the elements of Aristotelian humanism that had permeated the scholastics of the second period and their great disciple, to the genuinely religious pessimism that regarded all men as naturally corrupt and only individually redeemable by supernatural grace, and the State as a mere coercive power to prevent them from robbing and murdering one another. Lord Hugh Cecil's own view, I would point out, includes an element of humanism in the theory of national 'vocations,'—a conception which, though borrowed by him from religious usage, goes back to pagan philosophy. Each nation, he holds, has the duty of preserving its existence from a conviction of its own value for some end of civilized life: but this is hardly a view that would have found much response among the early Christians. Their "public spirit" (as Sir Oliver Lodge calls it) was apt to take a form that statesmen regarded as 'incivism,' such as the refusal of military service to the secular empire, and the determination to 'obey God,'—that is, the officers of the Church, rather than 'man,'—that is, the officers of the State.

Finally, however, I am willing to admit that no one, reformer or conservative, can in constructing a scheme of thought accept everything in so varied a collection of documents as the New Testament without selection. The law of contradiction forbids it.

To stress laid on the Christian pessimism regarding 'the world,' Sir Oliver Lodge might reply by quoting a text (which exists) favorable to evolutionary optimism. All that I maintain is that this is not historical Christianity.

T. WHITTAKER.

London, England.

THE TASK OF SOCIAL HYGIENE. By Havelock Ellis. London: Constable & Co., 1912. Pp. xv, 414.

PROBLEMS IN EUGENICS. Papers communicated to the First International Eugenics Congress held at the University of London, July 24 to 30, 1912. London: The Eugenics Education Society, 1912. Pp. xvii, 490.

In order to form a judgment on the present position of Eugenics, it may be well to recall Sir Francis Galton's definition of it (cited by Major Darwin) as "the study of the agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations." What then in the main ought this control to be,—predominantly legislative or depending on opinion? To this a perfectly clear answer can be given, partly by inference from the result of a representative eugenics congress, and in part explicitly from Mr. Havelock Ellis' hopeful and interesting work. The answer is that the controlling agency must be in the end opinion, and that that opinion, to be sound, will have to be based on much more knowledge than we at present possess. Many rash conclusions, especially pessimistic ones, can be refuted; but (as several contributors of papers to the congress definitely say) there is little that can at present give guidance. In any case, the papers generally are too inconclusive and mutually contradictory to induce the race to put its destiny straightway under the direction of biological experts.

I have called Mr. Havelock Ellis's book hopeful. Its hopefulness finds expression in the preface. "If it were not the mission of social hygiene to bring a new joy and a new freedom into life, I should not have concerned myself with the writing of this book." His general conception of eugenics brings with it substitution of the ideal of quality for that of quantity. Civilization, he finds, "excludes a high birth rate: there has